

## **REMARKS**

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated June 1, 2005. As set forth above, the priority data has been amended and updated.

### **The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Monson and Klan et al. In particular, the Examiner opines that the Applicant's argument was not commensurate with the amendment to the claims. In response, the Applicant has amended the claims and believes that such perceived disparity has been resolved.

As now recited in newly amended claim 1, the present invention provides a removable processor enclosure apparatus for use in a gaming machine, the gaming machine having a housing defining an interior portion, CPU electrical components to perform gaming thereof, and a first electrical connector disposed in the interior portion. The enclosure apparatus includes an enclosure securably containing the CPU electrical components in an interior space thereof, and is adapted for sliding receipt in the interior portion of the gaming machine housing between a mounting condition and a removal condition. In the mounting condition, the enclosure is mounted to the gaming machine housing, and a second electrical connector of the enclosure is coupled to the first electrical connector of the housing. In the removal condition, removal of the enclosure from the housing is enabled. The enclosure apparatus further includes a door movably mounted between an opened position, allowing access to the interior space, and a closed position, preventing access to the interior space. Finally, the enclosure apparatus includes a lock mechanism having a primary lock assembly and an independently operable secondary lock assembly. The primary lock assembly is

structured to selectively move between a locked condition and an unlocked condition. In the locked condition, the primary lock assembly locks the enclosure and the door together to lock the door in the closed position. By comparison, in an unlocked condition, the enclosure and the door are unlocked from one another to enable movement of the door to the opened position. Regarding the independently operable secondary lock assembly, it is structured to selectively move between an unengaged condition and an engaged condition. In the engaged condition, the secondary lock assembly is configured to contact the primary lock assembly in the locked condition to prohibit movement thereof to the unlocked condition.

First, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is not be construed in a means plus function format. Further, the Applicant has added a sufficient amount to structure to remove these claims from the veil of a means plus function interpretation. Regarding the §103(a) rejection, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to separate the operation of the secondary lock assembly from that of the primary lock assembly. In other words, the secondary lock assembly is independently operable of the primary lock assembly.

Neither Yamada nor Monson, alone or in combination, mention, suggest or imply any sort of independent, dual system of security. Hence, the minute structural limitations added to claim 1 in this amendment should be sufficient to overcome the §103(a) rejection without requiring the Examiner to conduct any additional search. In view of the foregoing arguments and amendments, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

### ***Conclusion***

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. It is believed that all claims now pending fully and patently define the subject invention over the cited art of record

and are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael L. Louie at (510) 843-6200.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, including any extension fees, which may be required or credit any overpayment directly to the account of the undersigned, No. 50-0388 (Order No. IGT1P017D1).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

By Michael L. Louie  
Michael L. Louie  
Reg. No. 36,988

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, California 94612-0250  
Telephone: (510) 663-1100